



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

formerly thought, but as a "development from the Latin participle *mixtus*". Mr. Bradley says (s. v.): "Our earliest example of the vb. in any form other than the pa. pple. is of the date 1538, and it was extremely rare until Shakspeare's time. Of the pa. pple. itself, the earliest examples are c. 1480 and 1526, the latter year being the date of our first quot. for *Mixt*, v. The O. E. *miscian* (the alleged by-form *\*mixian* is spurious), which has generally been assumed to be the source of the present verb, app. did not survive into M. E." Cf. Elyot's *Latin Dictionary*, s. v. *misceo*.

But to continue our illustrations would easily fill all the review-space of the Journal. Every page furnishes occasion for them, and to one interested in the study of words, each Part is as interesting as a novel. The fresh information, as well as the absorbing interest, will well repay even a brief perusal.

JAMES M. GARNETT.

English Literature from the Norman Conquest to Chaucer, by William Henry Schofield, Ph. D., Professor of Comparative Literature in Harvard University. New York, The Macmillan Company, 1906, pp. xiv, 500.

Dr. Schofield has planned an ambitious work worthy of the position he holds as Professor of Comparative Literature in the greatest of our American universities. A history of the literary activities in England for the three centuries following the Norman Conquest is no undertaking for the mere linguistic specialist or the enthusiastic critical novice; it implies not only a detailed acquaintance on the part of the author with the whole field of medieval literature, but also well formulated ideas on the progress of learning and the development of philosophical tendencies and schools of thought. Our author has been fortunate in having as a model the manual of medieval French literature of Gaston Paris, and he has shown his gratitude for his two-fold indebtedness for the plan, and in a large measure for the material of the work before us, by referring to the illustrious scholar as his "revered master."

The book begins with an introduction of twenty-five pages upon the social and political conditions under which this literature was produced. Dr. Schofield has laid due emphasis on England's debt to the Norman Conquest for reviving its zest for learning and religion, which had fallen on evil days long years before, and for making its literature one with the rest of Occidental Europe in its literary interests, erudite and vernacular. The influence of the University of Paris as the focus of Western culture; the significance of both the monastic foundations and the secular clergy as intellectual forces; the part played by the two chief agents in the production of the literature, clerics and minstrels, are denoted

in turn. But only a careless reading of his authority (Chambers *Medieval Stage*, I 46) would have lead him into stating that "St. Francis of Assisi stood on bridges and sang carmina trivialis" (18), or that the medieval English minstrels "were organised into "unions" and had their kings and other officials, were paid according to their skill, wore badges of their profession" (19). The charter for the first English guild of minstrels was only granted in 1469, later by a century than the period of which Dr. Schofield treats, and the title of king was not applied to the leaders (Chambers, I 55; II 260); there is no evidence of any other officials at any other time, and the only badges were the silver scutcheons of the municipal corporation, whose livery they wore (Chambers I 51).

The second chapter is devoted to Anglo-Latin literature. There is every token that this section which forms a fifth of the book was task-work for Dr. Schofield. For the literature of the subject he is indebted to only the most obvious general authorities, and his first-hand acquaintance with the works of the authors about whom he writes is very limited. At times one wonders at his failure to gauge the comparative value of the work of an author among his contemporaries, but one learns the secret of this defect when he finds that the source of many of Dr. Schofield's judgments is the *Dictionary of National Biography*, where, naturally, the estimate given is from an individual and not historical point of view.

One can not correct all of Dr. Schofield's errors of detail; it will be enough to note a few instances of his lack of preparation to deal with this part of his subject. The "certain commentaries on the Epistles of St. Paul" (p. 33), published under the name of Lanfranc is not his work, or would our author catalogue mere manuscripts in a popular treatise? The title given Lanfranc's treatise on transubstantiation, *Liber Scintillarum*, is only a scribal addition, and Anselm's *Exhortatio ad Contemptum Temporalium* is not a controversial treatise. Osbern of Canterbury translated only the life of St. Dunstan, and not several lives (p. 34) from Anglo-Saxon. Mention should have been made of Simeon of Durham's more important work *De Regibus Anglorum*, which is an original authority for the years 1119-1129 (p. 35). Dr. Schofield gives a correct definition of the rudimentary "arts" of the Trivium (49); why then does he translate the phrase in Gerald de Barri's autobiography; "*trivium ibidem egregie docuit*" with "lectured there on rhetoric and literature" (p. 40). Why does he accept Gerald's own statement not substantiated by any other evidence (Norgate, *Angevin Kings* II 456) that he "was made coadjutor with William de Longchamp, when Richard left England" (40), and can he cite by volume and page the authority responsible for his statement that de Longchamp was a "reformer of monastic abuses (60)"? And what a false conception Dr. Schofield has obtained of medieval society if he always translates

miles, "knight" by "soldier" (41). The expression in regard to Gerald's *Gemma ecclesiastica*, "the author's favorite book he presented to Pope Innocent III", calls for comment, as the first part of the statement has not the authority of Gerald himself, who merely tells how, out of the six books he presented to the Pope, the *Gemma ecclesiastica* received the preference (*Opera*, I 119; III 336). Roger of Hoveden's chronicle is an independent authority for a period thirty years anterior to 1192 (43), if with that year his account becomes more detailed. Ralph of Diceto's chronicle commences with 1148 and not with the creation, and is no mere compilation, although it is only with 1180—not 1188—that he begins to cite original documents. A postulated source of the chronicle of Roger of Wendover becomes "the book of the abbot John de Cella" (44). It was not Lanfranc who "established the scriptorium at St. Albans" (44), but his nephew, the abbot Paul. The assertion "Through his (i. e. Boethius's) translations, students generally became acquainted with Aristotle; for Greek was in early medieval times almost completely unknown" shows a surprising ignorance of the history of medieval philosophy and learning, not corrected elsewhere (cf. 81). Boethius translated only parts of the *Organon*, and the larger part of Aristotle's works, known to medieval scholars, were Latin translations of Spanish Arabs, and a knowledge of Greek had nothing to do with the situation. Peter de la Celle was not a celebrated teacher (51) least of all of John of Salisbury, whom he succeeded as Bishop of Chartres. It was in a letter of 1159 and not of 1169 that John speaks of his many travels, and does Dr. Schofield refer to the necrology of the church of Chartres when he speaks of the "obituary in the church"? *Policraticus* is the correct spelling of one of his chief works, and if he shows an acquaintance with the whole of the *Organon*, it cannot be said that he "conveyed to his readers a large part of Aristotle's *Organon*" (52). Why not refer to Robert Pullus by his English name Pullen; and is there the slightest evidence that Master Thomas Brown was "a sort of Chancellor of the Exchequer in Sicily" if he did hold such an office in England (53)? Our author has cited textually (55) Stubbs's translation of a fragment of a letter of Peter of Blois (*Seventeen Lectures*, 137); it would have been better to cite from the same source (*ib.* 164) the translation of another fragment, instead of giving an inferior rendering (54). Only a very careless reading of the same authority (136) could have lead Dr. Schofield to attribute to Henri Beaulerc a saying of his ancestor Fulk the Good (55). Bishop Golias was no more "a figure of Map's creation" than the *Apocalypse* and *Confession* were his works. In fact, more than twenty-five years ago Hauréau showed that neither of these poems was English in origin (*Notices et Extraits*, XXIX 2, 254 ff., 301 ff.), so there is no place for the analyses given by Dr. Schofield (58), any more than for that of *De Phillide et Flora* (70-71), of which the author was in all probability an

Italian (N. & E. XXIX 2, 308; XXXII 269). There is no evidence for stating that Adelard of Bath—to use the traditional form of the name, instead of the pedantic “Athelard”, adopted by Schofield—“established a school particularly for instruction in Arabic lore” (63). The only reason to mention Robert of Retines’s studies in Spain, where he died, is that he was the translator of Morien, mentioned by Gower (Steinschneider, Sitzungsber. d. Wien. Ak. Phil. Hist. Klasse, 149, IV 69). Daniel of Merlai (not Morley) was the author of only one book, of which very little has been published (V. Rose, *Hermes*, VIII 330 n., 334, 347). If Bernard de Ventadour resided at the court of Eleanor (68) it was when she was wife of the French king and not in England. But as our author notes all the other troubadours by their Provençal names, he should have written Bernart de Ventadorn, and even in Provençal one finds written the Monge de Montaudon, and not Montaldon. In the poem of Gaucelm Faidit “Fortz chauza es que tot lo maior dan” there is not the faintest suggestion of Richard being proclaimed the “ideal hero of chivalry and the honorable founder of tournaments.” The greatest authority on medieval Latin versification, W. Meyer of Speyer (*Abhandlungen I* 286–287) takes direct issue with Schofield on the influence of the form of vernacular verse on Latin writers (69).

What is Schofield’s authority for his astonishing statement that William IX of Poitiers was the patron of Bleheris; Bledhericus? (70)? The *Ars Rhythmica* is the name not of a book (74), but of a section in John of Garland’s *Poetria*, and the whole poems he introduces as examples are assuredly as much his own compositions as those found in the *Nova Poetria* of Geoffrey de Vinesauf, or de Cumeselz, to give him his real name (Not. et Extr. XXXV 432). Peter Riga was not a Dane “de Riga”, and why not adopt a modern spelling “Alain de Lille” instead of “Alain de l’Isle”. It was in 1210—a date accepted after much dispute—and not in 1207, that the Paris Council forbade the study of Aristotle’s *Physics*, and not of all his works (81), and this condemnation was not “practically abrogated” in 1231 (81). The Franciscan convent which received the library of Grossetete was not a “seminary” (83). What are the works of comment and exegesis on which the fame of Adam Marsh rested (86)? Would it not be better to gloss the word Chaldee with its equivalent in modern usage? The three great works of Bacon were completed in fifteen months, and not merely the *Opus Maius*, and the *Opus Tertium* is something much more than an introduction to the other works (86). Schofield should have warned his readers that his selection from Aucassin et Nicolette was from Lang’s purely literary translation, or else one would wonder why he translates “capes” by “amices”, and “jogleors” by “makers [poets]”, and uses such a meaningless phrase as “cloth of vair and cloth of gris” (93). Siger of Brabant was not “secretly done away with”, but killed by an insane clerk in public (*Rom.* XXIX 108, 628).

Recent Dante scholars have written in vain when Schofield writes *De Vulgari Eloquio* instead of *Eloquentia*, and are we to understand that Petrarch's treatise *De sui ipsius et aliorum Ignorantia* is hidden under the title *True Knowledge*? That one of Boccaccio's eclogues was the source of *The Pearl*, as argued by Schofield, has still to be accepted by the learned world. This incomplete list of errors is formidable enough; how much longer would it have been if the chapter had really fulfilled the promise of its title, instead of being padded in the most deliberate way with excursions on Welsh and Norse literature, on Virgil and Merlin as enchanters, and on medieval architecture, all of which would call for as much correction of details and conclusions as the rest of the chapter, if the critic wished to be as impertinent as the author.

With two such guides as Paris's manual and Gröber's article in his *Grundriss*, Dr. Schofield, in writing his fourth chapter on Anglo-French literature, had only to group together the Old French writers of insular origin, or with insular interests, and to emphasize details of special interest to English readers. But one must take issue with certain additions, introduced by our author, independent of his main authorities. The *Bréri* cited as an authority by Thomas in his *Tristan*, may well be the same as the *Bleheri*, mentioned by one of the continuators of Chrétien's *Perceval*, but all the probabilities are against the conjecture that he is the same as the *Blehericus* of Gerald de Barri, and there is not the slightest evidence for the statement that "he probably wrote, a half century before Crestien, poems in French concerning Gawain and other British heroes" (116). That Robert de Boron "has been identified with a landed knight of Hertfordshire" (117) is the barest conjecture (Paris, *Journ. des Savants*, 1901, 704). Walter Espec was only the agent in obtaining a copy of Geoffrey's history from the owner, Robert, Earl of Gloucester (120). The poem of Garnier de (not du) Pont Ste. (not St.) Maxence is something more than the most remarkable of the vernacular lives of St. Thomas (124); it is one of the few masterpieces of Old French literature. What authority is there for the statement that Jordan Fantosme "at Henry's command accompanied the army to take notes of the events"? And why state as a fact that he was "spiritual chancellor" of the diocese of Winchester, when the very office was a conjecture of Michel? But who would imagine that "the rhymed Alexandrines tirades" of Lanflost (123), the "strophes, monorhymes" of Garnier, and the greater part of Fantosme's "poem rhyming in clusters" were all written in the same metre? There is no evidence that the source of the *Conquête de l'Irlande* was possibly in metrical form (124). There is not a word about the dragon in Simon de Fraise's life of St. George (131). The life of Gregory appended to Angier's translation of his *Dialogues* is the translation of a Latin text, and not an independent addition as one would judge from Schofield's statement

(132). Few Anglo-French lyrics have been published and of these only a part are known to Schofield, and yet for him this is enough evidence on which to base a theory that "the Anglo-French being less light hearted and facile than the Provençal or the French of the Continent" found their lyric inspiration in praises of the Virgin (133). Truly an *argumentum e silentio*.

In the following chapter on "The English Language" it would have been well to include a study of the use of French in England, and the part it played in the development of the language, matters on which there are only hints elsewhere in the book.

With the Chapter on "Romances", the longest in the book, Dr. Schofield is in his own peculiar field of English literature, and his handling of the subject is the most original and suggestive that has yet appeared. But in the necessarily genetic method adopted in the study of the various types of this literary genre, he errs more than once in treating of the sources of English works. His account of the Old French epic is most remarkable. "The early cantilenæ, or lyrical songs in chorus" never bore the name of "chansons de geste" (148), which they preceded, and in some instances inspired. It was hardly "from the eleventh century on" that these cantilenæ "were transformed by professional poets", as we have three chansons de geste, which were written in that century. Nor is it true that "Geste came soon to mean an epic poem" as it hardly ever occurs with that meaning in Old French. And was it only "in their early forms" that they were "distinguished from the chivalric romances by their peculiar metre"? The rhymed Alexandrines of the late epic poems are not hard to distinguish from the octosyllabic metre of the romances. There is much to be said on the French epic in England, and the relation of the English translations to the other versions, but the only suggestion of these topics that one finds is that "the exact originals are not known" (155). Where in the English version of the *Chanson de Roland* does the translator "denounce wine and women" (151)? The unique manuscript of the *Siege of Milan* does not carry the story to the capture of the city (154). It is true that the *Sowdone of Babylon* narrates the capture of Rome by the infidels, but the second part like *Sir Ferumbras* is a translation of a version of *Fierabras*.

But it is the section upon the "Matter of Britain", that calls for the most adverse criticism. What place in a manual of English literature has a detailed description of the followers at Arthur's court, taken from the Welsh romance *Kulhwch and Olwen*, which can not be attributed to "early times" (163-4)? The one item, perhaps worthy of note—its favorable characterisation of Kei—is not mentioned by Schofield. The analyses of the various poems for which Schofield finds sources in Bretagne lays are convenient, but all his theories need to be reconstructed in the light of Foulet's sane and destructive criticisms of the earlier contributions of Schofield, who, however, clings with entire

faith to his ideas about the sources of the Franklin's Tale, in spite of Rajna's strictures (182, 194; cf. Rom. XXXII 204 ff). The conclusion of Eilhart's Tristan is not unique (203; cf. Golther, Zeit. f. franz. Sprache, XXIX 2, 153, Litteraturblatt f. germ. u. rom. Phil. XXVII 63). The one OF word cited by Paris, in the passage quoted (204) "tailloir" does not mean "stand" but "tray". The following paragraph is a paraphrase of a passage in the same essay of Paris, but neither here nor elsewhere can one find authority for Schofield's statement, that Tristan by singing lays "stimulated the affection of Isolot", when his wounds were healing under her care (204). Does Schofield base his assertion that Tristan was perhaps a Scandinavian hero (212) upon some place-names, that have been shown to be ghost-words (Rom. XXXV 596)? If there is occasion for an analysis of Chrétien's Chevalier de la Charrette—not Conte de la Charrette—(236-8), it should at least be correct. Lancelot and Gawain do not take separate paths in their pursuit of the ravisher of Guinevere, and Lancelot, far from being too late to attempt a rescue, has his horse killed; and for this reason, and not because "his horse breaks his leg", is he ready to mount the cart. The queen does not show her disfavor to Lancelot because he has ridden in the cart, but because he hesitated to do so.

It is not necessary to carry the detailed criticism further in order to give one's unfavorable judgment on the book, as a trustworthy manual of the subject. Attention has been called only to erroneous statements of facts; but occasions for finding fault with the author on matters of opinion, and even of good taste, present themselves just as frequently. Parts of the book are vitiated by two theories, to which Schofield holds through foul and fair; the discredited eighteenth century view of the influence of Provençal on English literature (67 ff. 133), and an exaggerated *not* or *but* more modern conception of Celtic influences in medieval literature. Schofield drags in allusions to Welsh and Irish literature, which give a measure of his Celtic scholarship, and for him "the king of the Celtic Other-world is substituted for Pluto" (185), and the "air-castle" in which Niniane imprisons Merlin, is of "a kind familiar to every reader of British tales" (251). A wider acquaintance with the literature of folklore would keep Dr. Schofield from seeing a Celtic source in so many literary motives, and would broaden the discussion of English texts, for which there is no immediate French source, and the consequent bibliographical aid in Paris's manual. For instance an acquaintance with the many versions of "The Envious and Greedy Man" would have made unnecessary the remark about the unchivalric conduct of the hero of Sir Cleges (322; cf. e. g. Dunlop's Geschichte der Prosadichtungen, Übers. F. Liebrecht, 257, 491); and the many analogues of The Smith and his Dame show that it has been assuredly "popular among the common folk" (330; cf. e. g. R. Köhler, Kleinere Schriften, I 132).

GEORGE L. HAMILTON.